

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 1 has been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of Applicants' application provides support for the amendment to claim 1. For example, at least Figure 1 provides support for the amendment to claim 1.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 11-13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,966,835 to Bakalar (hereafter "Bakalar") in view of EP 0 539 013 to Seeley *et al.* (hereafter "Seeley"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bakalar discloses a device for heat treating webs that includes cylinders 20 with IR burner modules 38 that heat an outer surface of the cylinders 20. See Bakalar at col. 1, lines 9-17; col. 11, lines 18-46, 52-67; col. 15, lines 32-59; col. 17, line 57, to col. 18, line 22. Bakalar also discloses additional IR burners 38B external to the cylinders 20 for heating sides of the web opposite to the cylinders 20. See Bakalar at col. 18, lines 52-64.

However, Bakalar does not disclose a non-contact infrared drier installation, as recited in claim 1. Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 1.

The Office argues on pages 2-4 of the Office Action that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Bakalar by the teachings of Seeley to

provide a non-contact infrared drier installation. However, such a combination would not provide a non-contact infrared drier installation, wherein the device configured to avoid suction of cold air between two adjacent rows of radiant elements fills a space between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements, as recited in claim 1, because the dryer of Seeley includes gas fired burners 22a-n, 23a-n spaced apart from one another without any device to fill the space in between adjacent burners. See abstract and Figure 1 of Seeley. The dryer of Seeley further includes air bars 18a-n, 19a-n but the device of Seeley includes spaces between these air bars and between the air bars and the gas fired burners.

Thus, the combination of Bakalar and Seeley would not disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1-8, 11-13, 15, and 16 because such a combination would not include a device configured to avoid suction of cold air between two adjacent rows of radiant elements that fills a space between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakalar. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9, 10, and 14 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, Bakalar does not disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1. Thus, Bakalar does not render claims 9, 10, and 14 to be unpatentable because Bakalar does not disclose or suggest all of the features of these claims. Furthermore, the Office appears to take Official Notice in regard to the features of claims 9, 10, and 14. Applicant submits that these features are not commonly known or disclosed in the prior art relied upon by the Office. Applicant respectfully requests that the Office provide prior art to show these features or withdraw the rejection. See M.P.E.P. § 2144.03.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakalar in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,950 to Riepe *et al.* (hereafter "Riepe"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Riepe fails to remedy the deficiencies of Bakalar discussed

above in regard to independent claim 1, from which claims 17-20 depend. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 15, 2009

By Glenn Law

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5426
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,371

Kevin McHenry
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 62,582